



Route 238 Working Group Meeting

April 28, 2004
Summary Notes

Committee Members

Bob Billmire
John Cavolowsky
Seth Kaplan
Audrey LePell
Ed Mullins (Alt.)
Sherman Lewis

City Representatives

Roberta Cooper - Mayor
Jesús Armas – City Manager
Dennis Butler – Director of Public Works
Robert Bauman – Deputy Director of Public Works

Others

Evelyn Cormier
Ken Price
Bob Preston
Christine Monsen
Jimmy Sims

Items Discussed:

Public Comments

Ms. Judy Nadrowsky, whose house is on the corner of Main and E Streets, asked what would she be looking at from her living room once the project is completed. Mr. Armas indicated that would be discussed during the presentation.

Approval of Summary Notes –March 24, 2004 Meeting

Summary notes were approved as submitted.

Finalization of Some Project Issues

Mr. Bauman noted that in response to member comments on several issues, we have modified the design. He then asked the members to provide their thoughts on some important issues, including bicycle access, median width and typical pedestrian crossing, pedestrian bridge locations, alternate solutions for access from I-580 to Foothill Boulevard, and revisions to proposed list of street access changes. Mr. Bauman discussed the two approaches regarding improvements to bicycle access within the project area, which consisted of improvements to facilities on parallel routes and within the corridor. Mr. Lewis indicated that he'd be interested in the parallel route option and asked if a bike route on the Hayward Fault line could be constructed. Mr. Bauman noted that would be on private property. Ms. LePell asked if any bicycle groups have been contacted and whether or not they have provided input for the options. Mr. Bauman said yes. Mr. Kaplan noted that he was involved during the time the City's Bicycle Master Plan was prepared and asked what consensus the group is giving. Mr. Bauman described the three options for bicycle facility improvements within the corridor and mentioned that the East Bay Bicycle Coalition had recommended 15-foot curb lanes rather than 14-foot curb lanes in order to accommodate bicyclists. Mr. Armas asked the members to provide additional input. Mr. Lewis indicated that 15-foot curb lanes are supported by HAPA. Mr. Kaplan and Mr. Cavolowsky felt there isn't enough data to support bicycle facilities on Route 238 itself. Mr. Cavolowsky further noted that he supports the alternate routes to accommodate bicyclists. However, he noted that we need to measure safety vs. inconvenience to bicyclists and this required more data. Ms. LePell wanted to hear public opinion on the bike issue. Mr. Armas asked if it'd be an accurate statement that the members, in general, supported parallel

routes, with regards to the bike issue, with the caveat that they may change their minds in light of additional information on the subject.

Mr. Bauman then went on to discuss the pedestrian crossings, including wheelchair ramps and minimum 20-foot wide medians to provide waiting areas, so that the new roadways could be crossed safely. He also discussed possible locations for pedestrian bridges, which included one at Foothill Blvd and B Street, one at Foothill Blvd and D Street, and one just south of five flags on Mission Blvd. The Mayor indicated that she would not be an advocate for pedestrian bridges, since they tend to be unattractive, prone to vandalism and graffiti, and are very difficult to comply with accessibility requirements. Ms. LePell disagreed and noted the number of crossings is too limited. Mr. Cavolowsky agreed with the Mayor's comment regarding problems with graffiti, but did not feel that over crossings limited pedestrian movements. Mr. Lewis suggested that pedestrian bridges make pedestrian movements difficult. The Mayor suggested an all-pedestrian phase at some of the intersections. Mr. Kaplan noted he has seen those all-pedestrian phases at intersections where there are lots of pedestrians, but that you can't stop traffic for just one person. Mr. Armas did clarify that we're merely trying to respond to an issue and not necessarily advocating a pedestrian bridge. Mr. Kaplan felt that the agenda report was fairly accurate on this issue.

Mr. Bauman then talked about the access from westbound I-580 to southbound Foothill Boulevard, the concerns regarding cut-through traffic in the County area, and discussed and compared the three options provided. Mr. Kaplan reported on one County neighborhood meeting where residents favored the flyover concept over the extension, but he noted that the flyover option may not be financially or physically feasible. Mr. Lewis felt that money was available in the State Transportation Improvement Program. Mr. Bauman further noted it appeared the working group was in agreement that the modification to the Strobridge Interchange was the most desired option. The working group members agreed with Mr. Bauman's statement.

Mr. Sims then provided revisions to the conceptual plans as suggested by the working group, which included connecting Armstrong and E Streets to provide circulation for local traffic instead of cul-de-sacing those streets; reduced right-of-way takes on Central Blvd and Berry Avenue creating a more useable frontage parcel at Mission Boulevard; and eliminating the cul-de-sac at Jefferson Street to provide right-in and right-out movements to and from Mission Boulevard. Mr. Armas felt that in the area of Berry Avenue, neighborhood access would improve, since a traffic signal at Mission and Berry would be constructed. Mr. Lewis felt that the schools at Mission/Calhoun/Jefferson need to improve their driveway access.

Mr. Armas also noted that the plans show the northbound left turn at Foothill and B and that C Street would remain one-way eastbound. Mr. Sims then discussed the right-of-way impacts on parcels based on those revised modifications to conceptual plans. Mr. Sims noted that Ms. Nadrowsky will see the street as she does at present, but not the wall, because it is lower than the road. She would likely see more landscaping in that the five flags will need to be relocated. Mr. Billmire asked if additional parcels south of the Hayward Plunge might be acquired to be combined with their parcel. Mr. Armas suggested we may want to discuss that with Hayward Area Recreation District. Ms. LePell noted that the School District will oppose the closure of E Street. Mr. Sims noted these changes resulted in reducing the number of parcels needed for acquisition from 145 to 133 and reduced the overall estimated project cost to approximately \$215 million.

Making Sense of the Data

Mr. Bauman opened the discussion by noting that in the last several months, the working group members have reviewed, discussed, and digested an enormous amount of detailed data regarding the proposed project. He indicated this data included year 2025 traffic conditions with and without the project as well as with a “reduced lane” concept. Some of the measures of effectiveness presented included intersections operating at Level of Service “F,” travel times for both northbound and southbound directions along the corridor, vehicle hours of travel, and miles of congestion, among others. He noted that clearly, the data shows that Year 2025 traffic conditions with the project are better than the “no project” or the “reduced lane” scenarios. Mr. Bauman also noted the Hayward Demand Model Results, presented as Exhibit D, which showed that the project resulted in 1,044 fewer vehicle hours traveled in the Hayward area during the morning and evening peak hours. Working group members were invited to share their observations based on the data presented to date.

Mr. Kaplan appreciated the data presented to the working group and liked the benefit to local streets information. He also wanted to hear the community’s response to the project. Ms. LePell presented her opinion in writing to the working group. There was some discussion that the cost of congestion was not a useful indicator. Mr. Lewis suggested that other costs, such as auto dependency and costs associated with vehicle miles traveled, was not reflected. Mr. Billmire suggested the project is desirable if funds were available. Mr. Cavolowsky agreed with Mr. Billmire and Mr. Kaplan and believed the project is being approached with integrity. He said it would be vital to provide community outreach, but noted it was impossible to satisfy everyone. He believed based on information presented that there is a clear benefit to the project. Mr. Mullin said that he believed the group has accomplished what it was tasked to do. He noted that the public must now decide and provide input as to what direction the project should take. Mr. Armas noted Mr. Brauer has passed on his opinion that the University is supportive of the project. He then asked the group whether it’s safe to say that it’s agreed that “something needs to get done and status quo is not acceptable?” Mr. Lewis paraphrased and said “there’s consensus.” The working group agreed. For the next working group meeting on May 26, Mr. Armas asked the members to think about what should be presented to the public at a meeting in mid-June. Some indicated a desire to see a 3-D model of the project, particularly the grade separations.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 PM.